



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,348	03/16/2001	Tom Marttila	6009-4601US	7865

7590
Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

06/03/2003

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, ISAAC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/787,348		MARTTILA, TOM	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Isaac N Hamilton		3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7 and 9-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 18, 20 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17, 19 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III, claims 11-17, 19 and 22, in Paper No. 07, filed 3-17-2003, is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The IDS was received in Paper No. 05, filed 1-13-2003, and was considered.

Specification

3. Objections to the abstract are hereby withdrawn in lieu of the amendment filed 11-29-2002 as Paper No. 04.
4. The amendment filed 11-29-2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "expanded" in the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 17, is not considered to inherent because there are several ways that a material can be expanded with out using extrusion techniques.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 3724

6. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are dependent upon a non-elected claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 19, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartsch et al. (4,647,358), hereafter Bartsch, in view of Willingham (3,648,757).

Regarding claim 19, Bartsch discloses a method for making a cathode shown in column 2, lines 31-60. Note cathode in figure 3; steel outer jacket 2; outer jacket is removed from at least one end in column 2, line 49-50; highly conductive inner core 3. Bartsch does not disclose a method of joining the parts of the bar by casting. However, Willingham teaches a method a method of attaching the core to the jacket by casting it in molten form as shown in figure 4. It would have been obvious to provide a method of attaching the core to the jacket by casting it in molten form in the combination as taught by Willingham in order to mold the core to jackets of varying shapes and sizes. Regarding claim 14, note that the jacket is held in a vertical position with the bottom end closed in Willingham.

Regarding claim 22, note copper core 3 in Bartsch.

Art Unit: 3724

9. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartsch in view of Willingham as applied to claims 19, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of Balthazar et al. (3,780,555), hereafter Balthazar. The combination discloses everything as noted above, but does not disclose a method of preheating the outer jacket. However, Balthazar teaches a method of preheating the outer jacket in column 4, lines 42-44. It would have been obvious to provide a method of preheating the outer jacket in the combination as taught by Balthazar in order to cool the molten core at a controlled pace. It is inherent that the core is preheated because the core is in the form of molten metal.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartsch in view of Willingham as applied to claims 19, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (JP 01180718 A), hereafter Yamada. The combination teaches everything as noted above, but does not teach a method of heating the outer jacket and the core after bonding. However, Yamada teaches a method of heating the outer jacket and the core after bonding in figure 5, elements 4 and 5. It would have been obvious to provide a method of heating the outer jacket and the core after bonding in the combination as taught by Yamada in order to contract the outer jacket to the entire length of the inner tube.

11. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartsch in view of Willingham as applied to claims 19, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of Beetle (4,807,688). The combination teaches everything as noted above, but does not teach a method of immersing an outer jacket, with holes in the upper part, into a melt of a core material essentially in a horizontal position. However, Beetle teaches a method of immersing an outer jacket 10, with holes 40 in the upper part, into a melt of a core material 60 essentially in a horizontal

Art Unit: 3724

position in figure 5. It would have been obvious to provide a method of immersing an outer jacket, with holes in the upper part, into a melt of a core material essentially in a horizontal position in the combination as taught by Beetle in order to take advantage of the metallostatic pressure head to fill the jacket with molten metal, thus eliminating the cost for any pouring equipment. Note column 2, lines 18-37.

12. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartsch in view of Willingham as applied to claims 19, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of Dwivedi (5,005,631). The combination teaches everything as noted above, but does not teach a method of immersing an outer jacket into a melt of core material in a vertical position wherein the bottom of the jacket is closed. However, Dwivedi teaches a method of immersing an outer jacket into a melt of core metal in a vertical position wherein the bottom of the jacket is closed. It would have been obvious to provide a method of immersing an outer jacket into a melt of core metal in a vertical position wherein the bottom of the jacket is closed in the combination as taught by Dwivedi in order to fill the volume of the jacket and eliminating the cost of any equipment needed to rotate the outer jacket.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 12, 18, 20, 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 11-29-2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that Willingham does not teach parts joined to each other in order to obtain a metallurgical bond by casting a core in molten form inside a jacket. However, it is

Art Unit: 3724

believed that Willingham does teach that the outer jacket and the core are joined together in order to obtain a metallurgical bond by casting a core in molten form inside a jacket.

Willingham shows the jacket 16 and the core in molten form being poured into the jacket in figure 6. Although the Jacket 16 is removed from the core as shown in figure 6, a metallurgical bond was formed because the core and the jacket are united in one solid piece as shown in figure 5.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, applicant asserts that since Balthazar does not attempt to bond the die with the pipe perform then there is no suggestion to combine Bartsch, Willingham and Balthazar. However, it is believed that in the art of casting preheating elements in order to control the cooling rates with respect to the different materials is well known. It is also noted that Balthazar does teach preheating the outer jacket in column 4, lines 42-44. Applicant also asserts that Yamada, Beetle and Dwivedi do not teach bonding the jacket and the core by casting, however, in figure 2 of Yamada, figure 5 of Beetle, and figure 1 of Dwivedi bonding of a molten core to the jacket is shown. It is further noted that immersion does not require an object to be completely submerged.

Art Unit: 3724

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac Hamilton whose telephone number is 703-305-4949. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 8am and 5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

NA
IH

June 1, 2003

Allan N. Shoap
Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700